

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. IX No. 13

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

August 15, 1979

## "Technology Transfer" Becomes a Trendy Item

In that long tradition of sudden, but usually short-lived, fascination with accelerating the payoffs from government investment in research and development, Washington has lately been directing attention to "technology transfer."

This amorphous successor to oceanography, desalination, cancer, nutrition, ecology, civilian technology, and so forth, was the subject of hearings last month before the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology. Rep. Wes Watkins (D-Okla.), who chaired the hearing, said the subcommittee "fully intends to take whatever steps are necessary" to increase the productivity of the federal research dollar. But it's still unclear—perhaps even to Watkins—what those steps will be.

In a press release made available at last month's

Atkinson admitted that the federal laboratories eat up a huge portion of the overall research budget. This year alone, Atkinson said, federal research spending will amount to nearly \$30 billion. Only \$5.5 billion—spread among 450 institutions—is spent at colleges and universities; the 779 federal laboratories get more than that, he said.

Atkinson apparently was not advocating a cut in the federal laboratory budget but he was quick to point out "that even a small change in the efficiency of a system of such size could substantially enhance research, innovation, and commercial use of research results."

Among the specific proposals that the NSF Director said might help the federal laboratories run more efficiently is a new "policy statement" at the national level, requiring federally supported laboratories to "devote some deliberate fraction of their resources to

*(Continued on Page 2)*

### **Congress Completes Work**

#### **On NIH Budget; Details — Page 4**

hearing, Watkins said he was cosponsoring a bill (HR 4672) introduced by Subcommittee Chairman George B. Brown (D-Calif.) "to establish centers to adapt federal research results into marketable goods and services by linking the federal agencies doing research with universities, state and local governments and industry."

According to Brown, the "National Science and Technological Innovation Act of 1979" would create an Office of Industrial Technology in the Department of Commerce and establish centers for industrial technology.

"The centers for industrial technology would be located at universities or other nonprofit institutions," Brown said. "They would conduct research supportive of technological and industrial innovation, assist in the evaluation of technological innovations, advise industry, and train entrepreneurs."

Despite the emphasis on new innovation centers, the ostensible topic of the Watkins's hearings was the role federal laboratories play in the process of technology transfer. But no one seemed to want to talk about federal laboratories.

Richard C. Atkinson, Director of the National Science Foundation, had many words to say on the subject but even he seemed to have other agendas on his mind.

## **In Brief**

True to the style that he followed during his 30 months as chief of HEW, Joe Califano was a blaze of activity right up to his last minute in office. One of his very last official acts was to send a letter to Assistant Secretary of Health Julius Richmond, urging him to get the Food and Drug Administration to make Eli Lilly and Co. revise the obfuscating warning that it's trying to get away with on the dangerous drug Darvon.

The Carter White House, which most of official Washington has written off as an irremediable basket case, didn't invite Califano to the swearing in of his successor, Patricia Harris.

Asked recently at a press briefing to explain why, after three years to prepare for next week's United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development (UNCSTD), the US delegation still lacked instructions, Ambassador Jean Wilkowski said that "it's like preparing your income tax return. Things get left to the last minute."

What's apparent—though, of course, no official will come out with it—is that the US regards UNCSTD as a nuisance that must be endured, and that its goal for the Vienna meeting is to minimize the political turbulence, rather than accomplish anything substantive.

## ... New Patent Legislation Gaining Ground

(Continued from Page 1)

university or industry cooperation."

The problem, he said, is that the federal laboratories are under the control of federal agencies with particular missions. If the laboratories spend too much of their time on activities unrelated to those missions, they are assumed to be over-staffed and over-budgeted.

Other witnesses, who represented universities, corporations, and government agencies, also called for government support, or at least promotion, of formal cooperative programs among their institutions. Sharing equipment would save money, and the collaboration of scientists could inspire new ideas, they argued. But there was little discussion of how those cooperative programs might be designed or what research might be conducted under their auspices.

In fact, little if anything was said about the actual research conducted at the federal laboratories or about any reallocation of the resources they now consume.

One of the few clearcut recommendations offered at the hearings called for requiring federally financed researchers to state the potential practical application of their work before the work is begun.

W. Novis Smith, director of research and development at the Thiokol Corporation-Chemical Division, Trenton, NJ, said he would go so far as to require researchers to create what he called a "viable commercialization scenario" as part of their projects, wherever possible.

Some researchers took exception to such suggestions. The scenarios, they said, would not only commit them to talk to industrialists, but would also force them to produce. The requirement, they argued, is incompatible with basic scientific research.

Meanwhile if the amount of Congressional talk about patent legislation is any indication, strong legal protection for inventors is gaining support as a way to get innovations out of the laboratory and into the marketplace.

One sign of this is that the Bayh-Dole bill, S 414, to provide patent protection for researchers is gaining steady support on Capitol Hill, while its critics are

### HEW Patent Aide Reinstated

Norman J. Latker, the controversial government patent expert who was fired last year, has been reinstated.

For over a decade, Latker worked in the patent office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Shortly before he was dismissed last fall, the 22-year veteran of government service had openly criticized his superiors for attempting to withhold patent rights from university researchers conducting government-financed research and development projects.

Officials in the department said Latker had been let go because he had not met department "standards" and because of "specific instances" of misconduct associated with lobbying for more liberal patent procedures. HEW officials have maintained, for example, that the patent officer used government stationary and equipment to lobby for legislation that they felt would bring windfall profits to universities. But Latker argued that protecting the patent rights of government-sponsored researchers was the only way to assure that innovations get into the marketplace. Moreover, he claimed that official charges were never brought against him.

A civil-service review board now says that the dismissal was illegal and must be overturned on procedural grounds. For several weeks HEW officials refused to comment on the matter, but now indicate they do not plan to appeal the decision.

growing increasingly silent.

The bill, similar to one introduced in the House, would allow non-profit organizations and small businesses to retain title to government-financed innovations for up to eight years. To avoid excessive profits, the bill includes a "pay back" provision requiring inventors who make large profits to reimburse agencies for the support they received in developing the innovation.

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1979

ISSN 0048-9581

Contributing Editor  
**Anne Roark**

Editor and Publisher  
**Daniel S. Greenberg**

European Correspondents  
**Michael Kenward (London)**  
**Francois Segquier (Paris)**

Circulation Manager  
**Alice Anne Freund**

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once each in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, \$84.50 (two years, \$149.50); individuals, \$44 (two years, \$75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

## R&D Money Bills Bugged Down in Congress

With a new fiscal year beginning October 1, only a handful of appropriations bills have passed both houses of Congress, and several of particular interest to the research community are bogged down in controversy.

The Labor-HEW appropriations bill, which contains most of the nation's biomedical research money, was stalled over an amendment which would withhold federal funds for welfare mothers who want abortions.

As members left for their August recess, most of the Administration's energy proposals were stalled in an endless series of debates on what energy conservation and development course the US should take.

And the bill that contains money for the National Science Foundation was also tied up, as was funding for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

While the NSF allocation fell just short of reaching the \$1-billion mark for the first time, the Labor-HEW bill, HR 4389, included just what researchers had hoped: the higher of the House or Senate figures for biomedical research in each part of the National Institutes of Health.

Arguing that biomedical research had been given substantial increases in the past, President Carter had opted for nearly level spending for each of the institutes in fiscal 1980. While neither the House nor the Senate agreed to go along with the President's figures, the two chambers also differed with each other on the amounts they would allocate for individual institutes.

By the end of a grueling negotiating period, however, House-Senate conferees had agreed that rising inflation and slowing US productivity justified the highest figures possible for health research. (See Page 4 for NIH budget details).

Education for the health professions did relatively well under the Labor-HEW conference agreement. While President Carter had urged the complete elimination of capitation, or per-student grants, to medical and health-profession schools, the conferees agreed to allocate \$81 million, a figure not as far behind this year's \$110 million as supporters had feared.

Assistance for health-profession students—as opposed to institutions—also rose above the President's request. The 1980 figure would be \$172 million, compared with the budget figure of \$79.5 million and last year's \$93.5 million.

The Labor-HEW conference report also deleted a provision in the earlier Senate version of the money bill to spend \$1 million on the expansion of clinical teaching facilities.

House and Senate conferees working on the HUD-Independent Agencies bill, HR 4394, approved \$996.25

million for NSF for the coming fiscal year. The conferees split the difference of the Senate's allocation of \$915.3 million for the Foundation's research and related activities and the House figure of \$896.8 million. Both chambers had agreed to provide \$84.7 million for NSF's science-education programs.

The conferees reported disagreement over NASA appropriations for research and development, with the House holding firm to its figure of \$3.8 billion, which was \$23 million less than the Senate wanted.

Both houses were predicting final action on the NASA money, along with agriculture and energy legislation, shortly after lawmakers return from their month-long recess on Sept. 5.—Anne Roark (The author is an Assistant Editor of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.)

## Congress Rejects Clamp on Biomedical Budget

There's room for a variety of conflicting opinions on how well the National Institutes of Health fared in this year's Congressional budget derby. Perhaps the best approach is the "compared-to-what?" measure, and on that basis, the crucial numbers are the following:

Since it takes about 10 per cent more each year just to remain in place, the basic numbers to start with are the \$3.186 billion that NIH got for the present fiscal year (1979) and the \$3.172 that the President's budget sought for the next fiscal year, which starts next October 1. Now, the reason that Mr. Carter took the extraordinary step of reducing the traditionally sacrosanct biomedical research budget is that (1) the 1979 budget was, because of Congressional largesse, some \$220 million above his request, and (2) he knew that Congress would not tolerate a one-year-to-the-next decline in NIH spending power—which it didn't. Starting with that \$3.172 billion request of his, the House and Senate piled on an additional \$243 million. That's considerably short of a 10 per cent boost, but not so bad, in view of Mr. Carter's original ploy of actually cutting the NIH budget.

As can be seen from the table on page 4, many of the component institutes of NIH did exceed the 10 per cent figure, but not among them were the National Cancer Institute and the National Heart Institute. Their appropriations are up, but by amounts that fall quite short of the booming rate of inflation. One effect of their relative decline is to be seen in the fact that NCI and NHI used to account for about half of all of NIH's budget; but now, with other institutes having

(Continued on Page 4)

## The Verdict from House-Senate Parley on NIH

| NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH  | Fiscal year 1979 comparable appropriation | Fiscal year 1980 Presidential budget | Fiscal year 1980 House bill | Fiscal year 1980 Senate bill | Fiscal year 1980 conference | Conference compared with— |                           | House bill   | Senate bill  |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|  |   |                                      |                             |                              |                             | Fiscal year 1980 enacted  | Fiscal year 1980 estimate |              |              |
| National Cancer Institute.....   | 936,677,000                               | 936,958,000                          | 961,158,000                 | 1,000,000,000                | 1,000,000,000               | + 63,323,000              | + 63,042,000              | + 38,842,000 | .....        |
| National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute.....                                  | 506,384,000                               | 507,344,000                          | 527,544,000                 | 547,544,000                  | 527,544,000                 | + 21,160,000              | + 20,000,000              | .....        | .....        |
| National Institute of Dental Research.....                                     | 65,213,000                                | 66,118,000                           | 68,318,000                  | 67,000,000                   | 68,318,000                  | + 3,105,000               | + 2,200,000               | .....        | + 1,318,000  |
| National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases.....       | 302,767,000                               | 305,746,000                          | 341,246,000                 | 315,000,000                  | 341,246,000                 | + 38,479,000              | + 35,500,000              | .....        | + 26,246,000 |
| National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke..... | 212,365,000                               | 212,322,000                          | 240,622,000                 | 242,000,000                  | 242,000,000                 | + 29,635,000              | + 29,678,000              | + 1,378,000  | .....        |
| National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.....                     | 191,328,000                               | 190,202,000                          | 215,402,000                 | 200,000,000                  | 215,402,000                 | + 24,074,000              | + 25,200,000              | .....        | + 15,402,000 |
| National Institute of General Medical Sciences.....                            | 277,628,000                               | 280,378,000                          | 312,478,000                 | 304,000,000                  | 312,478,000                 | + 34,850,000              | + 32,100,000              | .....        | + 8,478,000  |
| National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.....                  | 197,630,000                               | 204,381,000                          | 208,981,000                 | 204,000,000                  | 208,981,000                 | + 11,351,000              | + 4,600,000               | .....        | + 4,981,000  |
| National Institute on Aging.....   | 56,911,000                                | 56,510,000                           | 68,910,000                  | 70,000,000                   | 70,000,000                  | + 13,089,000              | + 13,490,000              | + 1,090,000  | .....        |
| National Eye Institute.....  | 105,192,000                               | 104,528,000                          | 107,528,000                 | 113,000,000                  | 113,000,000                 | + 7,808,000               | + 8,472,000               | + 5,472,000  | .....        |
| National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.....                       | 78,260,000                                | 79,012,000                           | 83,912,000                  | 83,912,000                   | 83,912,000                  | + 5,652,000               | + 4,900,000               | .....        | .....        |
| Research Resources.....  | 154,164,000                               | 154,199,000                          | 169,199,000                 | 164,000,000                  | 169,199,000                 | + 15,035,000              | + 15,000,000              | .....        | + 5,199,000  |
| John E. Fogarty International Center.....                                      | 8,989,000                                 | 8,989,000                            | 8,989,000                   | 8,989,000                    | 8,989,000                   | .....                     | .....                     | .....        | .....        |
| Subtotal, Biomedical research.....   | 3,093,508,000                             | 3,106,687,000                        | 3,314,287,000               | 3,299,445,000                | 3,361,069,000               | + 267,561,000             | + 254,382,000             | + 46,782,000 | + 61,624,000 |
| National Library of Medicine.....  | 41,431,000                                | 41,431,000                           | 42,431,000                  | 44,000,000                   | 44,000,000                  | + 2,569,000               | + 2,569,000               | + 1,569,000  | .....        |
| Office of the Director.....  | 20,427,000                                | 21,062,000                           | 21,062,000                  | 21,062,000                   | 21,062,000                  | + 635,000                 | .....                     | .....        | .....        |
| Buildings and facilities.....  | 30,950,000                                | 3,250,000                            | 3,250,000                   | 3,250,000                    | 3,250,000                   | -27,700,000               | .....                     | .....        | .....        |
| Subtotal, National Institutes of Health.....                                   | 3,186,316,000                             | 3,172,430,000                        | 3,381,030,000               | 3,367,757,000                | 3,429,381,000               | + 243,065,000             | + 256,951,000             | + 48,351,000 | + 61,624,000 |

### NIH (Continued from Page 3)

come into financial favor in response to the argument that the emphases on cancer and heart disease have created imbalances, the NCI-NIH share has slipped below the 50 per cent mark at Bethesda.

What this tells us about biomedical politics is that Congress still retains a powerful interest in making NIH money decisions; nothing comparable, for example, prevails in the budgetary affairs of the National Science Foundation, for which the President's budget usually suffers a slight trimming, but only as evidence of congressional frugality. NIH, however, deals with cures for sickness, a longtime Congressional favorite, and that's one subject on which Congress doesn't care to be a rubberstamp for the White House.

The accompanying table, from the August 2 *Congressional Record*, details the institute-by-institute progress of the NIH budget, as it finally emerged from a House-Senate conference just prior to the August recess; though changes are, of course, still possible, they are very unlikely.

### Research Commission Gets Grant

The National Commission on Research, established last year by a group of scholarly and professional societies to study snags that have developed in government support of academic research, has been awarded a \$100,000 grant by the Ford Foundation. The Commission grew out of a series of Ford-supported meeting several years ago.



## NSF Sees Growing Shortage Of Jobs for Science PhDs

Jobs will be available for nearly all work-seeking science and engineering PhD's in 1987, says the National Science Foundation in one of its periodic crystal-ball exercises—but a big jump is forecast in the percentage of those who will have to take employment in non-science/engineering fields.

In 1977, the Foundation reports, only 25,000, or 9 per cent, of the full-time S/E PhD labor force held non-S/E jobs or were unemployed. By 1987, it forecasts, the comparable figures for out-of-field and unemployment will be 70,000 and 17 per cent. This change will take place against a background of the S/E doctoral labor force rising from 285,000 in 1977 to 410,000 in 1987, according to NSF's estimates. But this increase in the ranks of manpower with advanced degrees will not be matched by a comparable increase in jobs related to science and engineering.

In NSF's words: "The number of full-time S/E positions (utilization) held by doctorates is projected to grow over the same period [1977-87] by 35 per cent to about 340,000. Industrial R&D utilization of S/E doctorates is projected to expand by 1987 to almost 70,000—39 per cent over 1977, primarily as a result of expected growth in R&D funding. In contrast S/E doctoral faculty utilization over the same period is projected to grow only 11 per cent to about 145,000."

One effect, according to NSF, will be that academe will account for a lower proportion of PhD employment, dropping from the 57 per cent of 1977 to a projected 35 per cent in 1987. "New S/E doctorates are projected to be more concentrated in non-profit organizations—7 per cent for the 1977 labor force vs. 16 per cent for new doctorates, and in industry—25 per cent of the 1977 labor force vs. 32 per cent of new doctorates."

## EPA Sets Up Three New Labs

Three \$500,000-a-year university laboratories are being established by the Environmental Protection Agency to perform long-term research on environmental problems. The laboratories, which come under EPA's Anticipatory Research Program, are located at the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Illinois, and the University of Oklahoma, which will operate the lab in collaboration with Oklahoma State and Rice University. EPA says the establishment of additional laboratories under this program is being studied. For additional information: Edward A. Schuck, Research and Development (RD-76), Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC 20460; tel. (202) 755-0655.

## Job Market for PhD Holders

[In thousands]

| Type of utilization                              | Total | Physical sciences | Engineering | Mathematical sciences | Life sciences | Social sciences |
|--|-------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 1977 Estimate                                    |       |                   |             |                       |               |                 |
| Labor force .....                                | 280   | 70                | 45          | 20                    | 71            | 73              |
| S/E utilization .....                            | 255   | 63                | 42          | 19                    | 67            | 64              |
| Non-S/E utilization .....                        | 25    | 7                 | 3           | 1                     | 4             | 9               |
| Non-S/E utilization as percent of labor force .. | 9     | 10                | 6           | 5                     | 6             | 13              |
| 1982 Projection                                  |       |                   |             |                       |               |                 |
| Labor force .....                                | 352   | 83                | 58          | 25                    | 88            | 97              |
| S/E utilization .....                            | 302   | 77                | 51          | 21                    | 76            | 79              |
| Non-S/E utilization .....                        | 50    | 6                 | 7           | 7                     | 12            | 25              |
| Non-S/E utilization as percent of labor force .. | 14    | 7                 | 12          | 16                    | 14            | 19              |
| 1987 Projection                                  |       |                   |             |                       |               |                 |
| Labor force .....                                | 412   | 95                | 72          | 72                    | 103           | 113             |
| S/E utilization .....                            | 342   | 86                | 58          | 22                    | 87            | 91              |
| Non-S/E utilization .....                        | 70    | 9                 | 14          | 6                     | 16            | 22              |
| Non-S/E utilization as percent of labor force .. | 17    | 9                 | 19          | 21                    | 16            | 19              |

† Includes unemployed.

Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: National Science Foundation

Worth noting about NSF's projections for 1987 is that, despite general forecasts of a dropoff in graduate school enrollments, the manpower forecasters have concluded that the ranks of science and engineering PhDs will expand at a compounded annual growth rate of about 4 per cent, while the total civilian labor force is predicted to grow at from 1.9 to 2.3 per cent. The net effect, says NSF, will be a 50 per cent growth in the full-time doctoral labor force.

With supply exceeding demand, NSF says, PhDs will be drawn into other fields—which appears to have been the case from 1973 to 1977; during this period, employers were able to "substitute doctoral for non-doctoral staff at little increase in cost. This hypothesis," the Foundation adds, "seems most reasonable for those types of positions for which doctorates are generally not considered essential. To the extent that this hypothesis is valid, past growth in doctoral staffs may continue through 1987 because similar opportunities for employers to upgrade staff should continue."

As for where the surplus will be greatest, mathematics is the leader, with NSF forecasting that by 1987, 21 per cent of PhD mathematicians will be in the "non-S/E utilization" category.

These and other data are from: *Projections of Science and Engineering Doctorate Supply and Utilization—1982 and 1987*; (33 pages), NSF 79-303, \$2.25, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. Stock No. 038-000-00414-0.

## Britain: Commons Science Committee Gets Axed

*London.* In one of its first acts to have a direct effect on science-policy matters here, the new Tory government has abolished the House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology.

In terms of power and influence, the Select Committee was a pale version of its American legislative counterparts, being composed of back-bench Members and without authority to legislate or affect money decisions. Nonetheless, during its 12-year existence the Committee had evolved into a kind of watchdog over the government's R&D activities, and, in the process, it came to look after both the interests of the scientific community and the public interest in research-related affairs.

With the Committee dead, those few MPs with an interest in science, not to mention the research community, now wonder if anyone in Parliament will pay attention to issues such as genetic engineering, alternative energy research, and industrial innovation—all subjects that have concerned the Committee in recent years.

In place of the old system of select committees—which produced a series of committees established along subject lines—the government is setting up a group of departmental committees. Thus each government department will have its own panel of MPs quizzing its ministers and civil servants.

The fear in the research community and among the science-policy set is that R&D matters will get buried in the general business of the departments, since research doesn't have the political sex appeal that would coax a group of MPs to look closely at their department's activities in that area. But the old Select Committee on Science existed for just that purpose.

The Department of Education and Science, for example, funds most of the research carried out in Britain's universities. But the "E" bit of the DES not only takes far more of the department's money than the "S" bit, but also arouses more political heat. So when the new committee of MPs on the education

committee settles down to produce a plan of work, it will almost certainly worry more about education—a matter on which the two major political parties in Britain have fundamentally different policies—than science.

Nuclear-reactor policy—a topic that exercised the old Committee and resulted in several long inquiries during its 12 years—may well appeal to the committee keeping tabs on the Department of Energy. But it is more likely that the energy committee will concern itself with oil and coal mining, both of which have a greater "political" dimension and are ripe for major battles between the parties.

Even when a subject does have some immediate appeal it is easy to think of various topics that will not be covered because they fall between the cracks. What committee, for example, will study genetic engineering, a topic that the Select Committee was investigating just before its dissolution. A group of MPs who went to the US to see what was going on there in this area didn't finish their study, but at the end of July the government printing office finally got around to issuing an interim report that the MPs had written just before the election in which they pointed out that they had some difficulty in understanding why this subject was in the hands of the DES.

At the moment the Department of Education and Science is the parent organization to which the Genetic Manipulation Advisory Group reports; but the concern is, after all, about public safety; so shouldn't it be the Department of Health and Social Security that controls GMAG? It is difficult to see how committees of MPs organized strictly along departmental lines will involve themselves in such interdepartmental feuding.

Much as the research community may voice these fears—and a few MPs agree with them—when the House of Commons voted on the new committee system it was accepted overwhelmingly, with hardly a voice raised in defense of the old system.

Ian Lloyd MP, who, as senior member of the government party on the old Select Committee, stood every chance of becoming the Committee's new chairman had it been reestablished after the election, tried to get Parliament to agree that research was something special and needed a committee of its own, but he was unsuccessful. (It is possible that a group of Irish terrorists eliminated any chances of keeping the Select Committee going when it killed Airey Neave, at one time the chairman of the committee and a close confidant of Mrs. Thatcher. He was expected to press the case for the Committee's retention.)

One thing that will not change under the new com-

(Continued on Page 7)

## Conference for Small R&D Firms

A National Conference for Small R&D Firms will be held in Washington, DC, October 24-26 under the auspices of the American Association of Small Research Companies, a non-profit organization that describes itself as the "voice of the small R&D community." The list of speakers includes senior officials from government agencies heavily involved with R&D. For additional information: Mr. S. D. Lovejoy, AASRC, 8794 West Chester Pike, Upper Darby, Pa. 19082; tel. (215) 449-2333 or 528-6093.

## In Quotes: Candid View of NRC

*From a statement by Victor Gilinsky, of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, to the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works:*

•

What I think is lacking up and down the line in the commercial use of nuclear energy is sufficiently meticulous and disciplined attention to detail . . . The cure may require a profound alteration of the relationship between NRC and the industry . . . This does not mean more regulation . . . What we need is more forceful regulation.

The reasons we have not had it are complex. In part it is because the relationship between the nuclear industry and its regulators has been flawed from the outset. In nuclear energy's developmental years, the safety experts at the Atomic Energy Commission were the low men on the AEC totem pole. The conditioning and attitudes that went with that status and—just as important—the consequent low regard of the nuclear industry for the regulators were inherited by the NRC in 1975. The NRC is by now a far more capable and self-confident organization; but it has not shaken that low-man image altogether. I believe that it will take a certain amount of time and strong leadership to do that.

## BRITAIN

*(Continued from Page 6)*

mittee system is the minimal back-up that the MPs will have. Each committee will continue to have a staff of no more than two or three parliamentary civil servants—these consider themselves a cut above the average Whitehall civil servant—which makes it almost impossible for the members to keep up with what's going on in the departments.

The old committee's major value was as an investigative body that questioned witnesses. These evidence-taking sessions, and the written evidence prepared for them, were often the only opportunities the public and the press had of finding out anything about government policy in numerous areas. And as civil servants were often put on the witness stand, this was just about the only chance any one had of seeing these otherwise faceless people in action. All that will carry on with the new set of committees, but the research community can expect the civil servants who hold its fate in their hands will find it easier to hide in the woodwork now that there isn't a special parliamentary committee to coax them out every now and then.—MK

## 11 Named to New Ethics Panel

The White House has announced 11 nominations for the President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research, which was created by Congress last year to take over from the defunct National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Behavioral and Biomedical Research. And then, too, there's HEW's Ethics Advisory Board, which remains in existence, but just to advise HEW, whereas the new commission has authority to look and advise beyond HEW. The nominees are:

Morris Abram (chairman), former President of Brandeis University

Renee Claire Fox, Department of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania

Mario Garcia-Palmieri, University of Puerto Rico Medical School

Albert R. Jonsen, UC School of Medicine, San Francisco

Patricia A. King, Georgetown University Law Center

Mathilde Krim, Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research

Donald M. Medearis, Mass. General Hospital and Harvard

Arno G. Motulsky, Center for Inherited Diseases, U. of Washington

Fritz C. Redlich, UCLA, professor of psychiatry

Anne A. Scitovsky, economist, Palo Alto Medical Research Foundation

Charles J. Walker, private medical practitioner, Nashville.

## NSF Issues Annual Report

Fresh off the press: The 28th annual report of the National Science Foundation (143 pages), which reports on activities supported by the Foundation and contains a plug for basic research, "Science: New Pathways and New Promise," by NSF Director Richard C. Atkinson. Available for \$3.25 from: US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. Stock No. 038-000-00407-7.

## Subscription Form

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$84.50; two years, \$149.50

Individual subscribers: one year, \$44; two years, \$75

(Overseas airmail, \$17.50 per year additional.)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

## State Science Office Survives Budget Attack

The State Department's version of a science office has survived a sneak legislative attack that would have halved its \$6-million budget and cut its staff from 138 to 69. In coming through safely, the office—properly known as the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES)—demonstrated that it has some good friends on Capitol Hill, but also that it has yet to shake off a reputation as the State Department's personnel dumping grounds.

The cut, which would have taken \$3 million of OES's budget for next year, was slipped through an appropriations subcommittee markup session by Rep. William V. Alexander Jr. (D-Ark.), who berated OES for incompetence, but who, according to various observers, was annoyed that a buddy of his couldn't get a job at the Bureau. Alexander's ire is said to stretch back to the days when former Rep. Patsy Mink headed OES, and it reportedly continued into the term of her successor, former US Ambassador to Jordan Thomas R. Pickering, a highly regarded career diplomat whose appointment to OES is regarded as evidence that Secretary Vance takes the Bureau seriously.

In any case, when Alexander's cut of the budget was taken up on the House floor last month, he let

loose a torrent of abuse against OES, as, for example, when he reported that "in a recent conversation which I had with the Under Secretary of State, Mrs. Benson, she told me, quite apologetically, that former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger told her that this bureau is where the Department of State places its incompetents."

To which Rep. Clement Zablocki (D-Wisc.) replied that Alexander "is speaking from the past; he is not speaking of the current situation . . . I submit that . . . since Ambassador Tom Pickering became head of this Bureau, there has been some improvement."

Similarly temperate praise for OES was offered by Rep. Pete McCloskey (R-Calif.), who said that Alexander "has done a service in pointing out that in past years, this new Bureau of the State Department has, on occasion, been the repository for less than the most competent members of the State Department. It is a little like the trust departments of banks in past years, where people whose careers held little promise were assigned. . ."

Other members, however, argued that OES has been resurrected by Pickering and that it is now performing well. An amendment to restore the money was then approved.

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid  
at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99  
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS  
300 N ZEEB RD  
ANN ARBOR MI 48106



